

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action, mailed December 20, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully noted. Claims 1-44 were pending in this application. Claims 1-7 were rejected. Claims 8-44 have been withdrawn from consideration.

By this Response, claims 1 and 8-44 have been amended, claims 2-7 have been canceled, and claims 45-51 have been added. Support may be found in the specification and the claims as originally filed. See, for example, paragraphs 0017, 0033, 0070, 0073, 0074, and 0200 of the publication of the instant application. No statutory new matter has been added. Therefore, reconsideration and entry of the claims, as amended, are respectfully requested.

#### **Drawings**

The Examiner objected to the drawings because Figure 12 shows air but does not specify how it is provided, whereas Figure 14 clearly shows a hole that provides air.

Applicants explain that the hollow portion of the support member 204 is not a hole for providing air, but is a space through which the electric feeder lines to the thermocouple 98 and the resistance heater are wired. The carrier gas is fed from a gas inlet 212 provided in the bottom portion 148. See page 35, line 36 through page 36, line 12 of the specification. However, the thermocouples 98 are not installed above every support member 204. Therefore, the support member 204 does not always need a hollow portion.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully urge that Figures 12 and 14 as originally filed are correct as shown, and that the objection be withdrawn.

#### **Claim Objections**

The Examiner objected to claim 7 under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because it depends on claim 4 which is also a multiple dependent claim.

By this amendment, both claims 4 and 7 have been canceled, thereby obviating this objection.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ganguli (US 6,772,072) in view of Kim (US 6,424,800). The Examiner also rejected claim 1 as being unpatentable over Ganguli et al. in view of Kaoru (JP 02-124796).

The Examiner rejected claims 2 and 3 as being unpatentable over Ganguli in view of Kim and further in view of Guenther (US 20040025370). The Examiner rejected claim 2 as being unpatentable over Ganguli in view of Kaoru and further in view of Wong (US 5,891,253). The Examiner rejected claim 3 as being unpatentable over Ganguli in view of Kaoru and Wong, and further in view of Williams (US 5,614,026). The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 5 as being unpatentable over Ganguli in view of Kaoru and further in view of Hatano (US 5,989,345). The Examiner rejected claim 6 as being unpatentable over Ganguli in view of Kaoru and Hatano, and further in view of Sandhu (US 6,499,425). The Examiner rejected claim 7 as being unpatentable over Ganguli in view of Kaoru in view of Ushigoe (JP 05-009740).

Applicants respectfully urge that the claims, as amended, are unobvious. Specifically, claims 2-7 have been canceled. Therefore, the rejections of claims 2-7 are moot.

Claim 1 has been amended such that it now recites Applicants' baffle plate. None of the above cited art, whether taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests Applicants' gas supply system as now claimed. The system evaporates metallic compound material contained in a material reservoir tank by a heating means. The baffle plate covers a gas outlet of the material reservoir tank. The baffle plate prevents unevaporated metallic compound material from entering into the gas passage. The example of Applicants' baffle plate that particularly is described by claim 46 is shown in Fig. 16. It covers gas outlet 176 in exemplary tank embodiment 140 as depicted in Fig. 15. For a discussion of this, please see page 37 of Applicants' specification, beginning in the first full paragraph thereof. Because the cited art, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest the claimed invention, claims 1 and all active claims which depend thereon are unobvious.

Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

### **Request for Interview**

Applicants respectfully request either a telephonic or an in-person interview should there be any remaining issues.

### **CONCLUSION**

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), and any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to **Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Attorney Docket No. 033082M244.**

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL



Michael A. Makuch  
Reg. No. 32,263

Date: June 12, 2008

1130 Connecticut Ave., NW, #1130  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Telephone: (202) 263-4300  
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329